This, certainly, was not much for the State, and so, in every way, the position was most satisfactory. In these circumstances he was not a little surprised that Mr. Belur Srinivasiengar should have characterised the financial position of the State as unsatisfactory and that the State was incurring losses every year for a long time past. He also added that the State was not the same as a private bank. A bank was interested in deriving profits from its transactions, but the State was interested in utilising for the benefit of its subjects all the revenue it derived. A private individual might be wrong in borrowing money for using it for his own personal comforts, but a State would certainly be justified in borrowing for the purpose of carrying out works of public utility like tanks, wells, roads and bridges. In conclusion, he complimented the Government for having been able to present a surplus budget for the coming year and thanked them for all that they were doing to help the people to tide over the present difficulties due to world causes.

At this stage, the House rose for the day to meet again at 12 of the clock on Monday, 17th June 1935.

FOURTH DAY.

Monday, 17th June 1935.

The House reassembled at 12 of the clock.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS— (*contd.*).

Prohibition of Raiyats' Conferences.

MESSRS. H. B. GUNDAPPA (Hassan Taluk) and A. S. NANJUNDAPPA (Alur Sub-Taluk).—

Q.—31. Will the Government be pleased to place on the table of this House :—

(*a*) The recent orders of Government prohibiting the holding of raiyats' conferences under the auspices of the People's Federation in the State ?

(*b*) How many such meetings were arranged to be held within the last 10 days of the month of March ?

(*c*) How many meetings were prohibited from coming off and what are they ?

(*d*) Is it not a fact that those meetings were arranged in order to represent to Government the raiyats' grievances and to get relief ?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN).—

A.—(*a*) No.

(*b*) Six.

(*c*) The meetings at the following places :—

(1) Nelapatna, Tumkur Taluk.
(2) Sugganahalli, Magadi Taluk, Bangalore District.
(3) Holera Kothanur, Kankanhalli Taluk, Bangalore District.
(4) Akkur, Channapatna Taluk, Bangalore District.
(5) Hunasanahalli, Channapatna Taluk, Bangalore District.

(*d*) No.

MR. H. B. GUNDAPPA.—The answer to question (*d*) is in the negative. On what basis did the Government think that the conferences were not meant to represent the grievances of the raiyats ?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—On the basis of the information that was before the Government.

MR. H. B. GUNDAPPA.—What was that information ?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—I am sorry it cannot be divulged.

MR. H. B. GUNDAPPA.—Had not the objects of the conference been clearly defined and also published in several newspapers ?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—That might have been done.

MR. H. B. GUNDAPPA.—If so, were not the Government aware of the objects ?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—Government did not receive any information from the leaders.

MR. H. B. GUNDAPPA.—Did not the objects of the conference come to the notice of the Government through newspapers ?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—Such information as was brought to their notice was known to them.

MR. H. B. GUNDAPPA.—May I know why the information contained in the newspapers was not relied upon by the Government ?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—The Government relied upon the information contained in the newspapers as well as in the reports they received.

MR. H. B. GUNDAPPA.—Had the Government received any information, before the conferences were held, that the leaders would do anything to disturb the public mind ?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—Government received information to the effect that the results of the conferences would be unsatisfactory.

MR. H. B. GUNDAPPA.—Are not these conferences a recognised form of expressing grievances and have they not been in vogue for a long time ?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—It might be so.

MR. H. B. GUNDAPPA.—Then, what were the specific reasons for prohibiting the conferences ?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—They were prohibited under orders from the magistrates concerned.

MR. H. B. GUNDAPPA.—May I know the reason why the Government thought of preventing the holding of the conferences ?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—Government were advised to do so.

MR. H. B. GUNDAPPA.—Was it not the duty of the Government to verify whether the objects of the conferences were as published in the newspapers or not ?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—That is a matter of opinion.

MR. H. B. GUNDAPPA.—Is it not a fact that the Government acted on one-sided information ?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—Government do not think so.

MR. B. S. PUTTASWAMY.—Is it the policy of the Government that the raiyats' conferences should not be convened ?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—I cannot make any statement on Government's policy here.

MR. B. S. PUTTASWAMY.—Why did the Government think that the conference would lead to unsatisfactory results ?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—As I said already, Government acted on the information before them.

MR. B. S. PUTTASWAMY.—What are all the sources of their information ? Do Government employ any spies ? And is there any provision for that in the budget ?

DEWAN.—I do not think these are questions which you need put. It was the decision of Government that it would not be in the public interest to allow these conferences to be held.

MR. H. B. GUNDAPPA.—Should not the Government have sent for the non-official leaders concerned and ascertained from them the objects of the conferences ? Without so ascertaining, was it right for them to have passed *ex parte* decision ?

DEWAN.—I do not think the decision of Government in this matter can be called *ex parte*.

MR. B. N. BORANNA GOWDA.—In preventing the conferences, was it the opinion of Government that the People's Party under whose auspices they had been summoned was not a responsible body ?

MR K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—I am not prepared to give any opinions now.

MR. B. N. BORANNA GOWDA.—Will they have any objection to allow such conferences to be held at least in future ?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—It all depends upon the circumstances of each case.

MR. H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Unless the Government let us know the reason why these conferences were prohibited, how are we to know whether in the opinion of the Government the objects of the conferences are good or not ?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—I am sorry I am not in a position to give you any legal or other advice.

MR. S. K. VENKATARANGA IYENGAR.—Is it not a fact that raiyats' conferences have taken place in the past ?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—They might have.

MR. S. K. VENKATARANGA IYENGAR.—Were those conferences allowed because they were not held under the auspices of any political party?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—I can only say that the raiyats themselves might have come forward to represent their grievances.

MR. S. K. VENKATARANGA IYENGAR.—But what is the objection to a political party conducting such conferences?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—The objection was not due to any political party convening them. The member might quite remember that some other conferences have also been prohibited in the past.

MR. S. K. VENKATARANGA IYENGAR.—Have raiyats' conferences been prohibited at any time in the past?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—All conferences are not raiyats' conferences. It all depends upon the circumstances of each case.

MR. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR.—What, according to the information of Government, were the objects of the conference?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—The objects were reported to be such as to lead to dissatisfaction in the public mind.

MR. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR.—If the Government were not clearly aware of the objects of the conference, how were they able to know that they were not desirable objects?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—I can only say that that was the opinion of the Government.

MR. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR.—From both newspapers and other reports, what exactly were the objects of the conference?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—Government were guided not so much by objects as by possible results.

MR. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR.—Why not let us know what the declared objects and what the ulterior objects, if any, were, according to the best information of the Government?

DEWAN.—I wish to say that Government are not prepared to give a reply to that question.

MR. V. VENKATAPPA.—Are the Government aware that in the year 1930-31 many conferences of raiyats took place under the auspices of the Prajapaksha party?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—Notice.

MR. V. VENKATAPPA.—Did those conferences lead to any adverse effects either on the raiyats or on the Government?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—Notice.

MR. V. VENKATAPPA.—Was it on the basis of those conferences that Government came to the conclusion that the conferences now in question would have dangerous effects?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—I have no information on hand now about the effects of those conferences.

MR. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—It is a matter for regret to hear the Government come out with a statement that the conferences had anything like ulterior objects. The leaders had defined the objects in the handbills that were distributed broadcast and published in all newspapers. What then was the basis for the Government to think that there were any ulterior objects?

MR. N. G. SANJEEVIAH.—Do the handbills that are said to have been circulated in advance of the conference bear any date?

MR. K CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—The omission was accidental. Apart from that, did not the handbills say that the objects of the conference were to bring to the notice of the Government by all peaceful means the grievances of the raiyats due to seasonal conditions and the famine relief works that they wanted to be taken up?

MR. N. G. SANJEEVIAH.—If it was the intention of the conference to attain its objects by peaceful means, where was the necessity to emphasise the term "peaceful means" so much?

THE FIRST MEMBER (*Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur* K. MATTHAN).—Whatever the declared objects of the conference, Government knew what the result would be, namely, setting in motion forces which the leaders themselves could

not control, and that was why Government prohibited those conferences.

MR. H. B. GUNDAPPA.—Do the Government believe that the object of the leaders of the conference was to canvass votes as was alleged by a member of the House in another connection?

MR. N. G. SANJEEVIAH.—I make that statement even now.

DEWAN.—Let me say that the leaders meant well, that the Government meant well and that everybody else meant well, too.

MR. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—We thank you for that statement.

Prohibition to hold the Raiyats' Conference at Naganahalli.

MESSRS. H. B. GUNDAPPA (Hassan Taluk) and A. S. NANJUNDAPPA (Alur Sub-Taluk).—

Q.—32. Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) What are the special reasons that led to the prohibition of the holding of the Raiyats' Conference at Naganahalli in Belur Taluk?

(*b*) Has it come to the notice of Government that it was the 11th Raiyats' Conference arranged to be held in the taluk?

(*c*) Will the Government be pleased to place on the table of this House the order or circular of Government prohibiting the above meeting?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN).—

A.—(*a*) The idea of holding a conference was abandoned by the leaders.

(*b*) No.

(*c*) No.

MR. H. B. GUNDAPPA.—The answer to question (*a*) is to the effect that the leaders themselves abandoned the idea of holding the conference. Is it not a fact that the District Magistrate sent for the leaders and said that he would have to prohibit the conference if it was not abandoned?

THE FIRST MEMBER (*Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur* K. MATTHAN).—No. Our information is that the District Magistrate sent for the leaders who told him that the gentleman who was to have presided was not well and they were going to drop the idea of a conference.

MR. H. B. GUNDAPPA.—Is it not a fact that Government issued instructions to the District Magistrate first and the District Magistrate sent for the leaders subsequently?

MR. K. MATTHAN.—Government asked the Deputy Commissioner to advise the people concerned in the matter and they accepted his advice.

Raiyats' Difficulties due to the introduction of the Agriculturists' Relief Regulation.

MESSRS. P. BASAVE GOWDA (Arsikere Taluk) and K. NARASIMHA SETTY (Arsikere Municipality).—

Q.—33. Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) What measures have been contemplated or are being contemplated to avoid the hardship caused in raising loans consequent on the introduction of the Agriculturists' Relief Regulation?

(*b*) (i) Whether it is known to Government that this Regulation has afforded facilities only to those who have raised loans previously but has caused hardship to those who require agricultural implements now?

(ii) If so, has any arrangement been made in each taluk office to readily grant loans to the raiyats to improve their lands and to purchase bullocks, seeds and manure?

THE GENERAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (MR. H. V. RAMASWAMI).—

A.—(*a*) and (*b*) In Government Order No. P. 1300-11—Legis. 20-34-2, dated 8th September 1934, a committee was appointed to examine how far the extension of the Regulation to the whole State has affected the credit of the agriculturists and to submit a report to Government indicating in what respects, if any, the Regulation requires to be amended. The committee's report